



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*REVERENCE AS THE HEART OF CHRISTIANITY*

CHARLES A. ALLEN

Waverley, Mass.

When we stand by the sea and watch a storm dash huge waves on the rocks with furious roar and tumult, the power of the ocean fills us with awe. When the storm passes by and the night comes on and the stars shine out, at first one by one and then in throngs, till the great dome is all aflame and infinite spaces open above us, lighted with innumerable fires,—while the grandeur of the scene awakens awe, the mystery and boundlessness of these evening skies awaken wonder also. But when the day dawns and we look around us and see some lovely landscape, we no longer feel either awe or wonder; both have disappeared with the shadows of the night and the mystery of the stars; we feel only admiration. Then, if we enter some home where sons and daughters gather around the chair of an aged mother, we see that they feel no awe, for she is feeble and they are strong; and perhaps there is no admiration, for her form may be bent and her features wrinkled; but when her children think of what her sweet goodness has been to them through many years, they feel a nobler sentiment. It is not mere respect, however, such as we always render to age; it is not mere gratitude and love; it is reverence.

In these pictures from nature and life we find suggestions of the differences between four distinct sentiments of human nature, each of which is the heart of a different type of religion. When they are thus vividly pictured, any one can see the differences. Yet they are often confused, and the consequences of this confusion are mischievous. For if we fail to note the difference between the lower and the higher sentiment, it is easy for us to live content with the lower type of religion, because we do not feel or understand the higher type. Thus we may content ourselves with a religion of mere awe or wonder, or with

a mere respect for certain ceremonies and edifices and sacred days, and may never rise to the religion of reverence because "reverence" means to us only awe or wonder or respect. It is a common mistake of those who are interested in religious organizations to think that they are very religious because they believe in the miraculous powers of certain relics with a kind of awe or rest their Christian faith upon the traditions of certain wonderful happenings in the past or are regular churchgoers and have great respect for the places and customs of worship, even though they seldom or never seem to appreciate the divine glory of goodness in men and women around them. Such a type of religious feeling is often hardly to be distinguished from paganism, however much it makes Christian professions and takes the Christian name.

In the religions of the Bible the appeal to reverence is characteristic; and in Christianity we find a distinctive type of reverence, which recognizes a divine presence, not only in saints and prophets, but in all human nature, in even the most degraded, and therefore feels the infinite value of every soul.

We may clearly discriminate between these sentiments by observing, as I have suggested above in certain pictures from nature and life, that they accompany different perceptions. Awe, for instance, usually accompanies a sense-perception of the stupendous power and magnitude of nature; wonder, a recognition of the limitations of our knowledge; admiration, mainly an aesthetic perception; reverence, always a moral perception. Awe can never be modified into admiration or reverence, any more than the feeling of weight can be transformed into a perception of colors. But awe can be followed by the higher sentiments or be felt simultaneously with them, while each retains its distinctive character, just as our absorbed attention to some objects of sight, in which we are heedless of all sounds, may be followed by a similar attention to certain sounds, or the eyes and ears may simultaneously observe their appropriate objects.

Therefore, we find that a careful writer like Professor Momerie defines reverence as "the surrender of the spirit to the attractive influence of goodness," and James Kidd says that it "is excited by nobility of character," and Martineau, that "rever-

ence" is "devotion to goodness," that "a religion of reverence bows before the authority of goodness," and that "a being manifestly under the influence of principles higher than our own awakens our reverence; a being with evident force of resolve to execute, more unfailingly than ourselves, what is simply on our level excites our admiration." Martineau elsewhere says of "wonder, admiration, and reverence," that "in the gaining of knowledge we have the first; in the perception of beauty, the second; in the presence of higher character, the third." But, as Goethe has said, Christianity teaches us to reverence what is beneath us, as well as what is above us,—which can be true in no other sense than Channing's, namely, that reverence recognizes moral goodness as divine, not only in the saint and in God, but also in the lowliest human soul; for the least germ of goodness is God's "real presence," and in reverencing even the possibilities of goodness we are reverencing "God in man." Thus, as Channing says, "Christianity lays the foundation of a universal love by inspiring reverence for the human soul, be that soul lodged wherever it may."

But the higher forms of religion are constantly tending to slip and slide into the lower forms, because most men feel the higher sentiments so faintly; and therefore a religion which centres in reverence may easily become some kind of paganism, without changing its name or disowning its saints, by merely substituting some lower religious feeling for reverence.

In the Middle Ages Christianity was apprehended very gradually by converts from paganism, in whose religious life awe and wonder and similar sentiments were predominant and reverence was seldom felt. The appeal to which they could most readily respond was, therefore, the appeal to awe and wonder; and the teaching of the Church was "subdued to what it worked in, like the dyer's hand." Awe for its great saints, for instance, was compelled by tales of their miracle-working power. Thus the memory of Francis of Assisi was glorified by legends of miracles, which awakened awe in those who could but dimly appreciate and reverence his saintliness.

A similar appeal to a lower sentiment we find today in the tendency of some minds to return to a nature-worship which appeals

to awe and admiration and wonder, but not at all to reverence, because such minds have ceased to believe in an Infinite Person whom they can really worship. In the strict sense of the word, there is no religion in nature-worship; for nature-worship is either mere superstition or else mere aesthetic enjoyment<sup>1</sup>; the sentiment of it can be nothing nobler than mere awe or wonder or admiration, whereas, as Martineau observes, "the transcendent form of reverence," that is, our reverence for the Supremely Good, "constitutes proper religion." Similarly Professor Upton says, "Religion proper does not clearly show itself in human nature till reverence for an authority manifested in the conscience presents the soul with a supreme ideal, in which the presence and the authority of the Eternal One are felt to be revealed."<sup>2</sup>

In the strictest sense, the essence of religion is not reverence, but loyalty to God. Nevertheless Martineau is right in saying that "the ascendancy of the greater soul over the lesser," which creates loyalty, "is won by touching the springs of reverence"; and, therefore, whatever appeal may be made to our awe or wonder or admiration can never for a moment control us, if the appeal to reverence calls us to our true allegiance,—as, for instance, when the awe or wonder or admiration that created the pagan religions of ancient times, and even the reverence for the divine justice and beneficence which was sometimes felt, came into contact with the reverence for the divine holiness and for the moral possibilities of human nature which Christianity taught

<sup>1</sup> For even the most intense feeling of a Divine Presence in the beauty of the universe does not involve any feeling of self-surrender to a higher goodness. Therefore the aesthetic recognition of God is a mere admiration which we welcome on account of the pleasure it gives us; yet simultaneously with this aesthetic feeling the feeling of self-surrender to goodness may be awakened by some moral ideal, in which we recognize a revelation of God which commands our reverence and obedience.

<sup>2</sup> So Edward Caird says, "The natural man [that is, the savage] is capable of fear and presumption, but never of reverence; he can be superstitious or profane but never religious. In other words, he does not really look up to the power before which he trembles, or, in any sense, conceive it as a better self, with which he can identify himself, even while he bends before it. And this means that he does not in the proper sense worship at all; for he does not rise to the idea of any being who deserves the name of God, as being higher than the self and yet not a mere object or not-self" (*The Evolution of Religion*, vol. i, p. 179).

the world. It was the profound and powerful appeal of Christianity to the latent reverence of earnest men for the highest goodness, when this goodness was revealed to them in the gospel-story, and the intense faith in the divine redeeming love which it awakened, that, more than everything else, account for the wonderful spread of Christianity in the first centuries of its history, and are the evident reasons why some branches of the Christian church today show much more vitality than others.

Martineau would also say that our feeling toward *ideals* of goodness is not reverence and therefore cannot be proper religion, if these ideals do not represent realities of character in man or in God, but are only thoughts in our own minds; for "a conception which reports itself as empty of reality can no more receive our reverent embrace than the shade of a departed ancestor or guide. . . . We cannot venerate our own idea." And therefore "the posture of a *religious* nature is reverence for character above us," and "to paralyze these [personal] relations" by substituting awe or wonder or admiration for reverence, "is to relapse into paganism."

But the method of Jesus was very unlike the pagan method. So far from trying to excite awe and wonder by his marvelous healing power and resting upon it his appeal for loyalty, he even tried to suppress these feelings of awe and wonder because they might dull the souls of his hearers to higher feelings. His "works" were works of compassion and love, and he appealed to them as expressing his philanthropy. We see this in his reply to the Baptist's disciples, when he points to these works and mentions last, as if it were the most important, although it involved no wonderful power to control natural processes, that "the poor have the gospel preached to them"; for this was the supreme expression of his philanthropy. But his healing power he seems to have found a perplexity and an embarrassment. After his first day of preaching and healing, when he had cured the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum and multitudes came to him in the evening, bringing "all that were sick," he fled from the city early the next morning; and when the apostles followed him, begging him to return and continue these wonderful cures, he refused, for he would rather go to other places, where the awe

and wonder of the people and their eagerness to be cured of bodily diseases had not been so aroused as to stifle the nobler feelings. He made no appeal to these wonderful cures to establish his authority as a teacher. His aim was, rather, by his preaching to appeal directly to men's hearts and awaken in them penitence and reverence and spiritual hunger and thirst and by this nobler appeal to win their deference and loyalty. "Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also; for to this end came I forth." They who did not respond to this nobler appeal were not the kind of disciples that he wished to win. Nicodemus professed to be convinced by the miracles; but Jesus refused to accept him as a disciple, and required of him to be "born from above" of a nobler spirit than mere awe and wonder; whereas they who found a higher life awakened within them by the appeal of Jesus needed no other evidence that his words were the truth of God.

The same is implied in the account of the coming of Jesus at night to his disciples, when he walked on the boisterous sea and entered their boat. They fell down in marvel and awe, exclaiming, "Truly, thou art the Son of God"; but he received their homage in silence and gave them no blessing,—such as he afterwards gave to Peter, when, moved not by awe but by reverence, he confessed his Master to be the true Christ and Jesus saw that Peter for the first time in some degree understood that He was becoming the true fulfiller of ancient prophecy, the true deliverer of his nation, not because of any wonderful power to control nature and to cure disease or any hope of re-establishing David's throne by military strength, but because of the exalted ideal to which he had consecrated himself and by which he pointed out the way of true salvation,—the ideal of a greatness which is glorified by humility and by self-forgetful devotion to the highest welfare of humanity. He thus suppressed in his disciples the feelings of awe and wonder so that he might awaken nobler feelings.

Therefore we must discriminate between these sentiments. For, as I have said, they accompany our perceptions of certain realities in nature and life; and, because these realities are so different from one another, the names for the sentiments should

be carefully distinguished. To confound these words makes it hard to distinguish the realities. No authority of great writers or of popular usage can justify such carelessness. For, as Martineau says, "words are made mischievous by indeterminate use." Yet some writers of the highest repute have been careless in this respect. Thus Emerson says that "the stars awaken a certain reverence, because, though always present, they are inaccessible,"—where he really means awe and wonder at the majesty and mystery of the stars. The author of *Ecce Homo* defines religion as an "habitual and permanent admiration,"—forgetting that admiration is merely one of the lower sentiments of religion (in the most general sense of the word "religion") and is lacking in some very religious people, as in many of the Puritans, who were indifferent to the beauty of nature and art, but profoundly revered righteousness. Another writer<sup>3</sup> defines reverence as "the feeling of admiration which instinctively goes with the thought of the divine power, wisdom, beauty, and goodness." He does not discriminate the admiration that wisdom and beauty and strength of will arouse from the awe that power excites and the reverence that goodness awakens. By using "admiration" in this vague and general way as including every feeling that nature and life excite in us, and by taking "reverence" to mean the kind of admiration excited by "the divine power, wisdom, beauty, and goodness," he deprives himself of any exact and specific terms for the feeling awakened by beauty and wisdom and for the feeling awakened by goodness, thus limiting his vocabulary and confusing in his readers' minds these different feelings and making it impossible for them to understand what Christianity really is. Lecky remarks that "reverence diminishes as civilization advances," that "great evils have grown out of it," such as "religious superstition and political servitude," and that "nearly all the social and political spheres in which reverence was fostered have passed away," where he evidently means a dread of unseen powers or a spirit of mere deference and dependence in both social and religious relations, thus confounding the highest type of religion with the lowest by this amazing misuse of a word. When thus

<sup>3</sup>A Catechism of Liberal Faith (Unitarian Sunday School Society, 1895), p. 67.



misused, words become mere tricks and frauds, so that people are led to think that reverence is only a kind of admiration or is quite the same as awe or dread or wonder, and then easily content themselves with mere admiration or awe or dread or wonder, and never clearly understand what it is to reverence either man or God, and so lose the habit of reverence and lapse from Christian faith into paganism.

This reverence has characterized all distinctively Christian institutions. It is, for instance, the mutual reverence of husband and wife as immortal souls that hallows the wedded tie in Christendom, as it is hallowed nowhere else,—a reverence that teaches patience, tenderness, forgivingness, and created the Christian home. It is the mutual reverence of fellow-citizens, of the rich and the poor, of the wise and the weak, as all alike children of God, that is, to use the words of Stopford Brooke, “the foundation of all noble and enduring democracy,” and created the ideal of the Christian state,—an ideal never yet fully realized, but which is gradually transforming our modern world. It is reverence for the most degraded human being, because, to quote Martineau once more, “the meanest is but the highest in the germ,” that created our Christian philanthropy, the noblest of all philanthropies; for even Buddhist philanthropy lacks just this reverence, does not see the infinite possibilities of human nature and the divine ministry of suffering and sorrow for the spiritual training of mankind, and therefore is more intent on removing the sufferings of human life than on promoting the spiritual growth of human souls.

Judaism did not teach this enthusiastic reverence for the human nature of all men as alike children of God and brothers in a common humanity. But Christianity revered even the slave and the savage, the felon and the outcast, demanded the abolition of all distinctions of race and caste, protected womanhood and childhood with special tenderness, and made the bondman and his master feel their essential equality before God. Neither did Judaism teach the highest reverence for God, such as Christianity taught when it interpreted his holiness, not as a mere separateness from sinners, but as a hatred of sin that longs to save every sinner from his sin and to communicate to him the divine holi-

ness, and therefore is forever seeking to "save that which is lost." It is with this distinctive Christian meaning of the word that Martineau says: "There can be no holiness [in God] that is not affectionate."

Stoicism, indeed, said something about human brotherhood, but in a feeble and half-hearted way as the mere academic talk of philosophers; for it was inspired by no reverence for human nature (even though a Seneca may have spoken some fine words about the sacredness of man), because, with its philosophy, it could feel no reverence for God. Therefore it created no great philanthropies, such as Christianity created, and no great popular movements of social regeneration and reform, such as Christianity has often inspired. For Christianity was unique, not in merely teaching a *doctrine* of human brotherhood, but in creating and widely disseminating a *faith* in the infinite value of every soul and the nobler feeling of brotherhood which this faith awakened. There is a sharp contrast between the spirit of Epicurus or of Marcus Aurelius, of whom Lecky says, "seldom has such active and unrelaxing virtue been united with so little enthusiasm," and, on the other hand, the magnificently enthusiastic spirit of Paul and Francis of Assisi, a fervent, self-sacrificing, profoundly reverent love of all mankind. Therefore, as the author of *Ecce Homo* says, "in every age the Christian temper has shivered at the touch of Stoic apathy." And whenever religion lapses into Stoicism, as there is a tendency in some Unitarianism today, the same chill benumbs its enthusiasm.

Reverence is capable of cultivation; but it can be cultivated and taught by personal influence only. There is a grave mistake in Emerson's words, "the soul knows no persons," if these words are taken in their usual sense; and Martineau is wiser when he says: "In matters of devout faith reverence for persons gives perception of truth in ideas." For, while the mere intellect, dealing with things and thoughts, knows only the impersonal, the soul, on the other hand, knows only persons, because its life is fed by those truths and sentiments of which we are made conscious by the influence of persons upon us, that is, by the influence of character; and, as Emerson himself sees, "character is higher than intellect." Therefore the "Over-Soul" must be personal, in

the sense of having moral character; otherwise we cannot reverence him; and, if we cannot reverence him, our religion can have no moral power over us, for we can have no feeling of loyalty to him. Then, further, the fellow-men whose goodness we reverence are our spiritual helpers, because "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God" shines through them into our own souls and wins us to aspire to the divine goodness that they reveal. Even the innocence and humility and trust of childhood are revelations of holy ideals; even the prodigal son in his repentance helps us to believe in the possibilities of human nature and in God's forgiving love; and the sinful woman at Simon's feast, whose many sins were forgiven because she had loved much, reveals to us the redeeming power of a generous love. Thus the personal influence of goodness in every form, even when it is but a faint spark in a sinful soul, awakens our reverence and teaches us the holiest truth.

It is the transcendent power of Jesus in all the ages since his time, that in him the supreme word of true religion was made flesh, and that by his life the distinctive truth of his religion, the faith in a divine love which is forever seeking to "save that which is lost," became an intense conviction in multitudes of souls.

It was a distinctive truth, because no saint or sage had ever taught it in any land, but the deep experiences of his own soul gradually revealed it to him. For in the Sermon on the Mount we find no teaching of such a divine love as is taught in the fifteenth chapter of Luke, and there is not the least expression of interest in the publicans and sinners. It speaks of God's *benevolent* love only, which sends the bounties of nature impartially to the evil as well as to the good, and forgives our trespasses, when we ourselves are in a forgiving spirit toward our fellow-men. Reconciliation must begin with our own seeking after God, —a doctrine which is distinctively Jewish. But early in the ministry of Jesus the love which healed those who were sick and suffering in body began to reach out to those who were in spiritual need; and a little later he was called "a friend of publicans and sinners," because his kindness drew these outcasts to him and wakened aspirations for a better life in men and women whom

respectable people abhorred. When, at length, he began with heavy forebodings that last journey to Jerusalem, his love became more tender for those who, like him, were "despised and rejected,"—they because they were so evil, he because he was so good. It was then that he told the three exquisite parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Son, to justify the ever-deepening humanity of his ministry by proclaiming a novel truth about God's relations to mankind and our own duties to one another. Thus in the discipline of trouble and disappointment his heart was taught what no saint or sage had ever learned, that man is always God's child, still having divine possibilities of goodness within him and still dear to the Infinite Heart, though apparently lost like the sheep and the coin and the wayward boy, and that, therefore, these degraded men and women have an imperative and holy claim upon us for reverent pity, trust, and love; for God has always been seeking them, even when they seemed to be far away from him, as the shepherd sought his wandering sheep. And this is the distinctively Christian doctrine of "grace."

Still, while reverence is thus exalted as the heart of Christianity, awe and wonder and admiration have their place in true religion; but we must insist that they should be always subordinated to reverence. For goodness is supreme in this universe. It is, for instance, the great saints and prophets who rule the hearts of the generations that come after them, and thus guide with power the course of human events. And there is no beauty or mystery comparable to that which flows into a human form when it is glorified by simple goodness and the Eternal God seems to make it his shrine. Ruskin says that there never was a really beautiful woman whose beauty was not the expression of the lovely character of either herself or some immediate ancestor. But, on the other hand, if we make reverence a mere Cinderella and clothe her sisters with the queenly robes,—if we exalt power or mystery or beauty as more divine than goodness,—then all the highest power and mystery and beauty of human life disappear. The fine arts, for instance, when in admiring loveliness of form and color they forget ethical ideals and are willing to glorify the sensuous beauty of that which is ethically base, be-

come themselves degraded and lose the vision of the highest beauty. But when admiration and awe and wonder become the handmaids of reverence, then they are transfigured into their grandest and fairest forms, and we recognize that there is no beauty so lovely as the beauty of holiness and no power so mighty as the power of unselfish, reverent love.

We do not truly worship God when we bow before him as the Almighty merely, for power is only his throne; or when we admire the beauty of creation, for this beauty is only his royal robe; or when we admire the intelligence with which all things are made and governed, for this is only his sceptre; or even when we wonder at the inscrutable mystery of his nature and providence. If we do not see that goodness alone makes him truly divine, then the throne is empty or some being of cruelty and malice may sit there whom we cannot worship, and the robe and sceptre tell us nothing of God himself, and the mystery makes him merely the Unknowable Existence. But when we adore the Eternal Goodness, we come into the presence of the living God, who sits on his throne of power, and wears his robe of beauty, and wields his sceptre of intelligence, and illuminates all the mysteries of the universe with the light of his love.

Then, when the moral revelation of God, that comes to us in our own hearts by the influence of saintly human lives, has given us faith in the Eternal Goodness, we can believe in the presence of this goodness in the most terrific manifestations of power in nature around us, even though nature gives us no assurances of an overruling goodness. Thus the awe with which we look upon these manifestations of power may be blended with reverence for the Unseen Love. Then we can also look upon the stars with reverence, not, as Emerson thinks, because they are "inaccessible," but because they testify of a Divine Presence, which the heart of Christian faith, enlightened by the influence of saintly lives, recognizes and reverences as the Eternal Goodness.

In his lectures on *Belief in God*, President Schurman speaks of "the faith of the modern scientist," who looks upon the world "with awe and wonder and a deep sense of mystery"; and he adds that "this attitude towards the universe is much more reverential than is too often found in those who have learned that the heart

of things is also infinitely good and loving. . . . To the scientist God is the principle of order, to the artist the soul of beauty, to the man of virtue the will that is absolutely holy. . . . Modern culture protests against the Puritan enthronement of goodness above truth and beauty. It regards them as co-equal graces."

President Schurman's vague use of "reverential" as covering awe, wonder, and admiration, confuses his thought. Undoubtedly Puritanism undervalued beauty and scientific truth in order to emphasize the supreme importance of goodness and of that spiritual truth which is revealed to us "through the human experiences of the conscience and affections." But in this emphasis Puritanism, even when it became fanatical in consequence of its bitter hatred of the moral corruption which at that time had often been blended with the artist's love of beauty, was yet intensely Christian and very noble. And the Puritan narrowness which is offensive to modern culture does not justify any lowering of moral ideals to an equality of honor with aesthetic ideals.

It is the great practical problem of true religion at all times, how to lift the world out of paganism, the worship of mere power or mystery or intelligence or beauty. We find an answer to this problem by cultivating reverence, by recognizing the supreme divineness of moral goodness, though it be in some homely form or feeble frame or lowly lot or narrow intelligence, and above all by adoring every manifestation of self-sacrificing and holy love, as when the dying Bunsen said to his devoted wife, "In thy face I have seen the Eternal One." But when we think to honor God or to exalt man by our mere awe or wonder or admiration, thus putting mere power or beauty or mystery or intellectual strength and skill on a level with moral goodness, as modern culture does, we sink into paganism.

The test of any Christian profession is not its dogma or ritual or history, but the practical expression it gives of reverence by its self-sacrificing enthusiasm of faithful service for the highest welfare of humanity. In surrendering itself to this spirit and to all the generous activities that this reverence creates, the church is surrendering itself to Christ in true discipleship. And in this

true discipleship which is "the unity of the Spirit," all controversies will be silenced and all Christians will co-operate in resisting the paganism of much of our nominally Christian civilization.

The innermost secret of Christianity, then, is a distinctive type of reverence. As a reverence for the Eternal Goodness who is ever seeking to save that which is lost, it is true worship. As a self-reverence which aspires to the noblest ideals because each of us is a temple of a Holy Spirit whose goodness we must ever more and more apprehend and emulate, it is true saintliness. And as a reverence for the divine image in even the most degraded of men and for the possibilities of goodness there, it is enthusiastic philanthropy.

The statement urged in this article that the Christian faith in human nature is distinctive of Christianity, has been often contradicted. A few quotations from eminent authorities in support of this statement will be interesting.

"He who has never looked through men's outward conditions to the naked soul and there seen God's image commanding reverence, is a stranger to the distinctive love of Christianity." Channing, in *Life*, Centenary Edition, 1880, p. 458. "The true Christianity,—a faith like Christ's in the infinitude of man." "Alone in all history, he estimated the greatness of man." "Thus is he, as I think, the only soul in history who has appreciated the worth of man." Emerson, *Divinity School Address*. In Christianity, "the individual has an infinite worth, as being the aim and object of the love of God." Hegel (quoted in J. H. Stirling's *Philosophy of Law*, 1873, p. 27). "The true meaning of the Christian faith," is its "reverential estimate of the human soul," its "sense of the infinite worth there is in man." Martineau, *Hours of Thought*, vol. ii, pp. 286, 258. "It [Christianity] assumed, for the first time in history, the infinite worth of the human soul." Dr. Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 334. "The Christian doctrine of the inestimable value of each immortal soul is the distinguishing and transcendent characteristic of every society into which the spirit of Christianity has passed." Christianity "displays an anxiety for the *moral* well-being of the castaways of society, such as the most humane nations of antiquity had never reached," "wholly foreign to the genius of Paganism." Lecky, *European Morals*, 1887, vol. ii, p. 34. "The special work which awaited Christianity was the transference into the mind of the world of its own distinctive principle, the value of a human soul." Dr. Matheson, *Spirit of Christianity*, vol. i, p. 297. "Christ saw man at his true value and died to give expression to his estimate; he is man rightly weighing man. The struggle of Christ in history is to bring men up to the point of duly valuing their fellow-men." Dr. Munger, *The Appeal to Life*, p. 18. "Faith in the infinite worth of the human personality in the sight of God,—if there was anything new in the thought of Jesus, it was this." Professor G. B. Foster, *Finality of the Christian Religion*, 1906, p. 481.